

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 231

CS 208 310

AUTHOR Olasky, Marvin N.
TITLE Reception of Edward Bernays' Doctrine of
"Manipulating Public Opinion."
PUB DATE 6 Aug 84
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass
Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8,
1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information
Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Communication (Thought Transfer);
*Intellectual History; Mass Media; *Modern History;
*Propaganda; *Public Relations

ABSTRACT

Ivy Lee and Edward Bernays are generally regarded as the founding fathers of modern public relations. While Lee has been the subject of a full biography that included contemporary reaction to his ideas, there has been no similar work on how Bernays' ideas were received, though his ideas were in some ways more radical. He believed that propaganda was the modern instrument by which intelligent people could fight for productive ends and could help bring order out of chaos. He argued that public opinion was slow and reactionary, and that those who use the psychology of public persuasion to bring about changes in public opinion are performing a great public service. Initial reactions to Bernays' first book were enthusiastic, but by 1928 he was coming under heated criticism for his forthright work "Propaganda." By 1935 his techniques were being compared to those used by Nazis, but he weathered this period comparatively unscathed. During the 1940s, Bernays was noted as the most successful publicist in the country. He pioneered fellowships at United States universities for the study of public relations, and is now generally regarded as a man with a vision of authoritarian liberalism mixed with corporatism, and as a seminal thinker concerning the synthesis of a new Freudian perspective with the older practices of the publicists' trade. (CRH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

PUBLIC RELATIONS DIVISION

RECEPTION OF EDWARD BERNAYS' DOCTRINE OF
'MANIPULATING PUBLIC OPINION'

Dr. Marvin N. Olasky
Department of Journalism
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712
(512) 471-7708

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marvin N. Olasky

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to the Public Relations Division
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
Annual Convention, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida
August 6, 1984

ED245231

CS 208 310

RECEPTION OF EDWARD BERNAYS' DOCTRINE OF
'MANIPULATING PUBLIC OPINION'

Ivy Lee and Edward Bernays are generally regarded as the two founders of modern public relations. While Lee has been the subject of a full-scale biography which covered well both his ideas about public relations and the reaction to those ideas among his contemporaries, there has been no similar work on how Bernays' ideas were received.¹ Yet in many ways they were more radical than those of Lee. Lee was a reporter turned public relations practitioner; throughout his career, he most often saw his role as one of providing news -- sometimes slanted news, but news all the same -- to other reporters for the benefit of his clients.² Bernays, however, believed in propaganda, and proclaimed that, "Intelligent men must realize that propaganda is the modern instrument by which they can fight for productive ends and help to bring order out of chaos."³ He described the public relations practitioner as someone adept at "Manipulating Public Opinion" -- that was the title of an article Bernays wrote for The American Journal of Sociology in 1928 -- and argued that since "public opinion is slow and reactionary," those who use "the psychology of public persuasion... to bring about changes in public opinion" are performing a great public service.⁴

What was the reaction to Bernays' bold equation of "manipulation of the public mind" with the "social purpose" of speeding change and preventing chaos?⁵ When he initially

proclaimed his doctrine in a 1923 book, Crystallizing Public Opinion, first reactions were enthusiastic. For instance, The Bookman called Crystallizing Public Opinion, "A short but remarkably clear study. A book that every business man as indeed every artist should read."⁶ The Dial also noted approvingly that the new book was not just about publicity, for "It is the larger aspects of this activity which concern Mr. Bernays... The book delves into psychology, ethics, salesmanship; it undertakes to show, in effect, how people may be divided into groups, how groups may be reduced to herds."⁷ Industry magazines such as the Dry Goods Merchants Trade Journal also took notice: "No book has ever been written before taking up the idea of 'public opinion.'...How to influence an important individual, how to break up a hostile group by influencing a section of it, how to appeal to the entire mass-- these are all problems that every man who is a leader in business today has confronting him constantly."⁸ Sales Management commented that Bernays "has written a very interesting book on the influencing of public opinion and the building of good will. When Napoleon said, 'Circumstance? I make circumstance,' he expressed very nearly the spirit of the work which must be done by a man who influences public opinion."⁹

At the end of some articles, though, a quizzical note often appeared. The Survey noted with perhaps loaded vocabulary, "Mr. Bernays writes frankly of the processes by which the herd instincts are exploited in the instincts of a new and far-ranging salesmanship."¹⁰ The Dial had a line, "And with herds to play with, what may not the shepherd accomplish?" Ernest Gruening,

later to become a senator from Alaska, wrote in a 1924 review that,

This new sublimation is in response to an obvious need. Mr. Bernays points out that ... 'perhaps the most significant social, political, and industrial fact about the present century is the increased attention paid to public opinion,' especially by men and organizations whose attitude not long ago would have been 'the public be damned.' Significant, no doubt. But, considering the nature of this attention, is it cause for rejoicing? Will the final result be greatly different for a public which, while it no longer tolerates being 'damned,' guilelessly permits itself to be 'bunked'? Is seduction preferable to ravishment?... Mr. Bernays views the matter more rosily. His conclusion is that the public relations counsel is destined to fulfill his highest usefulness to society 'in the creation of a public conscience.' Not only may one doubt that the glorified press agent will fulfill this destiny, but that a public conscience thus 'created' would be useful or desirable.¹²

There was evident concern about the potential power of the public relations practitioner.

Such criticism became more heated after Bernays' publication in 1928 of his forthright book Propaganda, with its clear leanings toward subtly authoritarian "democracy." The reviewer in Critic and Guide, for instance, commented sarcastically about Bernays' "apparent-- or well-assumed-- sincere belief that he is doing some useful work" with "some real social value..."¹³ Henry Pringle's solid article, "Mass Psychologist," in a 1932 issue of The American Mercury, showed thorough understanding of the implications of the paradigm; Pringle wrote that compared to Bernays, "Theodore Dreiser is a starry-eyed idealist. Eddie is a stern realist who operates on the demonstrable theory that men in a democracy are sheep waiting to be led to the slaughter."¹⁴

Inquiry magazine critiqued Propaganda in 1929 with the suggestion "that we should be a whole lot better off if all propaganda were offered undisguised-- that is, with full revelation of the promoting interests."¹⁵ Leon Whipple, in The Survey of 1929, wrote of Bernays' apparent belief:

that somebody 'who understands the mental processes and social patterns of the masses' should manipulate these controls so that people can know what to believe or buy. Society is too complex and folks too dumb to find out themselves. The counsel steps in to help-- at a price. He rides here in a world of 'high-spotting,' fashion-making, window-dressing, blind instincts, and artificial habits, where events are created to make news, and indirection is the watch-word... The book is worth reading, for the Herr Doktor gives an almost metaphysical exposition of his creed... The general idea is to control every approach to the public mind so we get the desired impression, often unconsciously.¹⁶

The implications of Bernays' new public relations paradigm began to alarm some political, academic, and religious observers during the 1930's, as concern about the political effects of mass manipulation (especially during economic downturn) became more widespread. For instance, in a 1934 letter to President Roosevelt, Justice Felix Frankfurter referred to Bernays and Ivy Lee as "professional poisoners of the public mind," exploiters of foolishness, fanaticism and self-interest.¹⁷ Sociologist E.T. Hiller discussed Bernays' work and argued that "such widespread efforts to manipulate opinion constitute a financial burden, a perversion of intellectual candor, and a menace to political sanity."¹⁸ The Michigan Christian Advocate noted that "there is danger in discovery of the mass mind" as advanced by Bernays.¹⁹ The journalists were most consistent in their criticism concerning the effect of Bernaysian manipulation on accurate

information flow. Their perspective is well represented by frequent, sarcastic editorials in Editor & Publisher criticizing Bernays' "new and higher ethics" and his "synthetic news creations."²⁰ In 1930, for instance, Editor & Publisher complained that Bernays' method is "to manipulate mass psychology and influence trade by propaganda so artfully insinuated into public consciousness that the victim does not realize that an unseen hand is leading him by the nose."²¹ It was the apparent dishonesty of Bernays' approach that rankled, the editorials repeatedly stressed. In 1933, readers were told that Bernays tries "to sanctify propaganda as 'a vital social force.' But it is the same old dope... describing the technique of twisting the public nose in any direction desired."²² Editor Marlen Pew called Bernays "my pick as the young Machiavelli of our time."²³

A certain amount of economic jealousy was evident here, of course. Newspapers prospered largely by selling advertising space, and there had long been concerns among publishers that the free publicity which businesses might gain through public relations ingenuity would cut into revenues. When Editor & Publisher labelled Bernays "the most modern, smoothest, highest paid and most effective of all the expert tribe of propagandists and spacegrabbers,"²⁴ we are clearly seeing the newspaper establishment reacting as an institution with monetary interests of its own. But both principal and principle were at stake here. Bernays' pride in "manipulating public opinion" was diametrically opposed to the newspaperman's traditional (although perhaps naive) faith in reporting "what happens" and letting readers sort

out the consequences. This larger question was never far beneath the surface of those frequent Editor & Publisher editorials: What happens to reportage based on the excitement of unpredictable events and free will at work, when more and more front page material happens not because of individual will but due to group pre-planning?²⁵

Bernays' own public relations also tended to suffer when comparisons were made between his techniques and those of the Nazis. One book in 1934, for instance, criticized the techniques of propaganda "carried to perfection by the Lord Northcliffes in wartime England, the Edward Bernays in industrial America, and the Dr. Goebbels in fascist Germany."²⁶ Barrons linked American and German-style public relations in 1935 when it noted that, "Hitler, by making what Bernays calls 'Devils' for the German masses to look down upon, has aroused the acclaim of the more easily swayed masses."²⁷ A 1934 article by Abraham H. Cohen in Opinion noted that Bernays had written a preface to a book on public opinion and commented, "Now that the art of Ivy Lee and Edward Bernays has been reduced to a science, and is receiving the attention of the Universities, we may soon look to a new crop of manipulators of the public will. Who knows, but that a new American Goebbels...is now pouring over this book."²⁸ Bernays himself added some gasoline to this fire when he argued, as did Goebbels, for the necessity of strong men, human gods, to emerge as influencers of public opinion; for instance, in a speech to the Financial Advertisers Association in 1935, Bernays said that the main answer to financial problems is "to acquire an entire

new set of outstanding human living symbols that will hold public confidence...Publicists, economists, leaders in research, the heads of great educational institutions can and should be made the human symbols to bring new faith and strength."²⁹ Journalists compared statements of that sort by Bernays to the thoughts of Goebbels or, alternately, Stalin. But Bernays was able always to escape criticism of that kind. He escaped much less scathed than one might expect.

Bernays was able to overcome criticism partly because there was, for many, little arguing with success. Life in 1933 noted that "...at 1 Wall St., there is Edw. L. Bernays, nephew of Sigmund Freud, who has probably made more money out of applied psycho-analysis than all Vienna ever saw."³⁰ The Bulletin of the Financial Advertisers Association examined profit figures in 1933 and then called Bernays "the outstanding counsel on public relations in the United States today, a profession he was largely instrumental in creating."³¹ Business Week in 1937, noted that Bernays was able to understand "the mass mind, to reduce its workings to a scientific formula, to motivate its reactions." His ample retainer was a bargain because "He finds a direct way to mass minds through group leaders."³² Bernays' style was also appealing, as The Commentator in 1938 noted: "Our striped-pants press agents of today don't brashly crash editorial gates. Their methods are more subtle. Edward Bernays, one of the most successful of the craft, can talk to his clients about human psychology with an expansiveness that would convince you of what he is, the nephew of Sigmund Freud; when he comes back for an

encore you're puzzled as to whether or not he isn't Freud's uncle."³³

Comments of those sorts are based on human toleration, but not professional admiration. The latter began to come to Bernays not just because he was successful, but because some saw him as successful in socially useful ways which contributed to the holding back of chaos. For instance, an important book of the late 1930's, Business Finds its Voice, noted that large organizations, seeking to overcome popular Depression antipathy, had needed new public relations methods to survive in order to perform their socially constructive activities. Bernays had found the secret: Far better "to implant an idea in a group leader's mind and let him spread it than to write up an idea and send it to the papers as a release, in the old-fashioned way..."³⁴ Newsweek was attracted by the hiddenness of persuasion: "One of Bernays' favorite symbols is the iceberg: What you see is big, but what you don't see is a lot bigger. Like the iceberg, much of Bernays' own work is invisible."³⁵ Even some highly-specialized publications caught on to the usefulness of the new methods and praised them; for instance, an article in Etude, a musicians' magazine, called Bernays, "one of the most distinctive human products of our modern and highly complicated age... Press agents, or their equivalent, had existed since the early days of recorded history, but here was a new type, a scientist, applying all the latest discoveries in the social sciences to his task of gaining acceptance from the public for his client's products, enterprises and ideas."³⁶

By the 1940s, according to Current Biography of 1942, Bernays had become "United States Publicist no. 1, head of a profession which he built up, publicized, and named: counsel on public relations."³⁷ Historians were labeling Bernays "the ablest public relations man."³⁸ By then, Bernays was moving to cement his approach by establishing it in colleges and universities. He had been the first to teach a university course on public relations (at New York University in 1923); he had written books and would write textbooks used in classrooms, and would develop the history of public relations which other textbooks would use in writing their own chapters on tradition and method; but he went one step further, as an Advertising Age article indicated: "Bernays, often called 'U.S. Publicist No. 1,' has not only developed a far more profound concept of public relations, but has pioneered in establishing fellowships at American universities to carry forward the study of public relations. ...It is Mr. Bernays' hope that from the studies of the men and women holding these fellowships will come 'a body of interpretative material which will help orient public relations thinking of the men in charge of our destinies in the postwar period.'"³⁹

Bernays' understanding of the importance of seizing the academies was another way in which he differed from Ivy Lee and some other early twentieth century public relations practitioners. Most of Bernays' peers were essentially nineteenth century journalists intent on pleasing their clients through adept use of the traditional, decentralized channels of

communication. Bernays, however, anticipated greater centralization in government and media, and the consequent growth of a new bureaucracy. He advocated governmental licensing of public relations counselors, or at the least a set pattern of formal, university training befitting those who would form a latter-day mandarin class. Bernays also tried to enlist proponents of greater economic centralization in his public relations planning. One common misapprehension concerning Bernays was the idea that he was trying to hide his techniques and abilities from liberal critics. To the contrary, Bernays was one of the first to realize fully that American twentieth century liberalism would increasingly be based on social control posing as democracy, and would be desperate to learn all the opportunities for social control that it could. Thus his 1928 article in The American Journal of Sociology. Thus his candor in Propaganda.⁴⁰

Later, the association of Bernays and twentieth century liberalism became even clearer. The series of full-page advertisements during 1944 in The Nation and The New Republic, which Bernays paid for and later issued as a book entitled Plain Talk to Liberals, shows the degree of similarity between Bernays and the left on the importance to "democracy" of economic planning and social control; a short book Bernays published in 1945, Take Your Place at the Peace Table, was a clear appeal for a form of mild corporate socialism.⁴¹ Professor Pitman Potter, reviewing the latter book in the American Political Science Review, noted with some puzzlement that the book was "a mixture

of honest liberalism and incipient cynical fascism."⁴² But that mixture was exactly what Bernays believed to be essential, given his understanding of the failure of nineteenth century liberalism, and the twentieth century "necessity" of uniting liberalism with social control to avoid chaos.

Potter made much sense in his specific criticisms. He noted that in Bernays' writing, "There is much talk of the individual common man and open discussion and truth and accuracy, but much more of molding public opinion by various tools and weapons and plans and strategies, of swaying individuals and masses by powerful techniques of persuasion, by 'the tested skills and practices of the professional public relations expert.'" Potter spotted the apparent contradiction in Bernays on one page warning the reader that he was about to be duped, and on the next page providing specific instructions concerning the most effective ways of duping others. Potter observed the way that, for Bernays, means were subsidiary to ends: "If inaccuracy is to be abjured, it is-- as far as we are told-- only because it may provoke mistrust and loss of interest." Potter also noted that those means had been given a trial since the time when Bernays initially espoused them: "The author presumably intends only welfare and happiness for humanity, but his methods are largely identical with those portrayed in Chapters VI and XI of *Mein Kampf*."⁴³

What Potter did not understand, though, is that the contradictions apparent to a classically-trained political

scientist formed a seamless web in the new world of public relations that Bernays was proposing. If the "individual common man" has no real individuality, as Bernays argued in Propaganda -- only "rubber stamping" by one propagandist or another, then one more duping does no harm to individual souls. And if Hitler had hit upon the techniques and used them for evil purposes, then that would be all the more reason-- given the inevitability of these techniques being put into use and the inability of men to resist them-- for those hoping to avoid chaos to rush the techniques into use before evil could turn them into a triumph of fire.⁴⁴

Some recollections of intellectuals of that era give the political flavor of Bernays' ordinary discourse. Fulton Oursler describes meeting Bernays at a dinner party and perceiving him "A wily fellow, forever enchanted with his own skills... trying to apply the doctrines of his uncle, Sigmund Freud, to control the thinking of masses of people in behalf of big business, while advocating a kind of mild socialism of his own."⁴⁵ John T. Flynn, writing in The Atlantic in 1932, caught this when he wrote that "Bernays is a philosopher, not a mere business man... Unlike his distinguished uncle, he is not known as a practicing psychoanalyst, but he is a psychoanalyst just the same, for he deals with the science of unconscious mental processes. His business is to treat unconscious mental acts by conscious ones. The great Viennese doctor is interested in releasing the pent-up libido of the individual; his American nephew is engaged in releasing (and directing) the suppressed desires of the crowd.

[Bernays] is none the less a philosopher because he does not wear side whiskers and drone in solemn and abstruse dullness, or because he has devised a way of running his philosophy through a meter and sending bills for the service."⁴⁶

Flynn also spotted Bernays' primary interest in popularizing his ideas in order to achieve real power, not wealth or status or even perceived power. After a few critical paragraphs concerning Bernays' financial connections, Flynn wrote, "In spite of all this, it must be said that Bernays remains singularly free from swank and make-up. Small of stature, careless in his dress, not always even newly shaved, he resembles rather a diminutive, absent-minded professor than the alert business man. What is more, he is utterly without posture when he talks about his profession. He offers no hypocritical explanations about the purposes behind his campaigns; he considers them quite proper..."⁴⁷ That was Bernays' style throughout his career: Throughout, Bernays stuck to his belief that the job of the public relations counsel was to produce socially useful propaganda.

Bernays, in other words, impressed some of the social thinkers of the 1920's and the 1930's because he seemed to be a fascinating man of ideas as well as practice. This trait has been particularly appealing to those social historians who have examined thoroughly the impact of public relations thinking on the general culture. J.A.R. Pimlott, in Public Relations and American Democracy, 1951, argued that Bernays' writing "stood alone among works dealing specifically with public relations in having exerted any influence outside the narrow public relations

world or much influence within it." ⁴⁸ Daniel Boorstin called Bernays' writings "among the most sophisticated, philosophically self-conscious, and literate works on public relations." ⁴⁹ Harwood Childs praised Bernays for grasping the importance of group leaders in influencing the public, for stressing the vital impact of manufactured and dramatized events, and for thus understanding that publicity is only one of the multiple dimensions of public relations propaganda. ⁵⁰

What was often missed even by the political scientists, though, was that Bernays was not a business conservative, nor a liberty-seeking liberal, but a man with the vision of authoritarian liberalism, mixed with corporatism, that few others were able or willing to proclaim so early on. Bernays not only rode the wave of popular psychology and desire for social control, but also became a seminal thinker concerning the means of synthesizing a new, Freudian perspective on man with the older practices of the publicists' trade. He proclaimed not just the inevitability but the centrality of propaganda techniques. A comment colorfully made in the show business newspaper Variety in 1960 may be the best testimony to his effectiveness: "Bernays did a book entitled Propaganda in 1928, but in those days propaganda was considered a rare form of word-racketeering. Today you can't see the truth for the slanted stories." ⁵¹

Footnotes

1. See Ray Eldon Hiebert, Courtier to the Crowd: The Story of Ivy Lee and the Development of Public Relations (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1966).

2. Ibid., see pp. 315-317 especially.
3. Edward L. Bernays, Propaganda (New York: Liveright, 1928), p. 159.
4. Bernays, "Manipulating Public Opinion: The Why and the How," The American Journal of Sociology, May, 1928, pp. 959.
5. Ibid.
6. The Bookman, April, 1924, p. 188.
7. The Dial, May, 1924, p. 468.
8. Dry Goods Merchants Trade Journal, April, 1924, p. 100. Quoted in the superb bibliography compiled by Keith A. Larson, Public Relations, the Edward L. Bernayses and the American Scene (Westwood, Mass: F.W. Faxon, 1976). This volume appears to miss nothing, and often even quotes the most pertinent parts of the books and articles cited.
9. "Turning Public Opinion Your Way," Sales Management, March, 1924, pp. 648, 730.
10. The Survey, March 15, 1924, p. 714.
11. The Dial, May, 1924, p. 468.
12. Ernest Gruening, "The Higher Hokum," The Nation, April 16, 1924, p. 450.
13. Critic and Guide, May, 1929, p. 197.
14. Henry Pringle, "Mass Psychologist," The American Mercury, February, 1930, pp. 156-157.
15. "Sea Heroes and Cigarettes," Inquiry, March, 1929, pp. 54-5.
16. Leon Whipple, "Letters and Life," The Survey, March 1, 1929, pp. 743, 747.
17. Max Freedman, ed., Roosevelt and Frankfurters: Their correspondence, 1928-1945 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), p. 214.
18. E.T. Hiller, Principles of Sociology (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1933), p. 621.
19. Michigan Christian Advocate, July 14, 1932, p. 6. Cited in Larson, p. 483.
20. Editor & Publisher, December 29, 1928, p. 42.
21. Ibid., September 20, 1930, p. 42.

22. Ibid., June 17, 1933, p. 40.

23. Ibid., November 11, 1933, p. 44.

24. Ibid., October 26, 1929, p. 20. Some of the frustration was explicit; on December 7, 1929, Editor & Publisher included the following verses: "Eddie Bernays frames it up./ Frames what up?/ Frames 'news' up./ Eddie Bernays frames 'news' up/ And makes the papers cover./ Eddie Bernays gets the cash./ Gets much cash?/ Yes, much cash./ Eddie Bernays gets large cash/ That once went into paid space." (p. 54) Still, more than greed was at stake here. An Editor & Publisher editorial of September 15, 1928, referred to Bernays as the "most audacious, blatant, ponderous, insistent of the self-styled public relations counsel 'profession,' then noted that "no matter what virtuous men Mr. Bernays or Mr. Ivy Lee or other professional propagandists may be, the device they seek to establish in public life is dangerous because it is irresponsible and is calculated to break down advertising practice, which responds to checks and balances, evolved from experience and conscience during a century of study and trial." (p. 32) Advertising has also changed its character during the past half century, and it is now difficult to be so sanguine about its prospects, but the distinction between paid space clearly marked off as advertising matter, and public relations-created "situations of reality" which appear as news and carry the implicit third-party endorsement of a newspaper, is still a valid one.

25. Editor & Publisher wanted newspaper leaders to ask themselves that question. As one editorial of July 27, 1939, put it, "Perhaps someone can explain to us why it is that certain publishers who would instantly discharge a reporter for 'making news' will accept the synthetic news creations of press agents..." (p. 32)

26. William Harlan Hale, "Youth Uses Its Own Head," in Alfred M. Bingham and Selden Rodman, eds., Challenge to the New Deal (New York: Falcon Press, 1934), p. 212.

27. Ernest F. Henderson, "Public Utilities -- Our 'New Deal' Devils," Barron's Weekly, August 12, 1935, p. 11.

28. Opinion, November, 1934, p. 35.

29. Editor & Publisher, September 14, 1935, pp. 8, 37. In 1935, also, an Editor & Publisher editorial writer could not resist getting off another timely zinger: "Eddie Bernays proposes a cabinet office of Secretary of Public Relations. Goebbels is our candidate. (February 23, 1935, p. 36).

30. "Untrammelled Press," Life, September, 1933, p. 12. Quoted in Larson, p. 474.

31. Bulletin of the Financial Advertisers Association, July,

1935. Quoted in Larson, p. 377.

32. "Public Relations -- First in the Order of Business," Business Week, January 23, 1937, pp. 32, 36.

33. John B. Kennedy, "The Trumpeters' Trade," The Commentator, December, 1938, p. 37.

34. S.H. Walker and Paul Sklar, Business Finds Its Voice: Management's Effort to Sell the Business Idea to the Public (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939), pp. 26-27.

35. Newsweek, February 3, 1947, p. 61.

36. "The Musician's Relation to the Public," Etude, April, 1936, pp. 209, 256. See also May, 1936, p. 292.

37. Maxine Block, ed., Current Biography: Who's News and Why: 1942 (New York: H.W. Wilson, 1942), p. 76.

38. Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller, The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America (New York: Macmillan, 1942), p. 310.

39. Advertising Age, February 21, 1944, p. 39.

40. The Bernays paradigm, like much recent liberal thought which argues that need for greater political centralization, is based on a thorough-going historicism. Bernays emphasized that in a large scale society there were only two choices: manipulation or social chaos. He saw history moving in a certain direction and public relations practitioners obligated to climb on the locomotive. Like Karl Mannheim, who did not allow for the possibility that large scale societies could avoid a central planning mechanism-- for Mannheim, the choice was only between good planning and bad -- so Bernays would not allow the possibility that true reality might reign; he could only emphasize that the choice was between construction of socially useful "situations of reality" and those natural realities which would lead to social chaos. In that sense he was very much in tune with Spengler, who closed his dismal book on the West's decline with the statement, "We have not the freedom to react to this or that, but the freedom to do the necessary or to do nothing. And a task that historic necessity has set will be accomplished with the individual or against him."

41. Bernays, Plain Talk to Liberals (New York: E.L. Bernays, 1945); Take Your Place at the Peace Table (New York: International Press, 1945).

42. American Political Science Review, August, 1945, pp. 818-820.

43. Ibid.

44. Bernays, Propaganda. p. 20.
45. Fulton Oursler, Behold This Dreamer! An Autobiography (Boston: Little, Brown, 1964), p. 235.
46. Flynn, Atlantic Monthly, May, 1932, p. 563. Flynn noted that Bernays "is a social psychologist engaged in carrying out in actual practice" powerful psychological and sociological theories, and argued that Bernays' success led to questions about "what defensive mechanism society can erect to protect itself against such powerful and subtle forces." Flynn wrote that it was "barely possible" that individuals "now so freely exploited for ends which they often neither see nor understand may at last become so familiar with the public relations counsel and his methods that they will stop lending themselves to manipulation."
47. Ibid..
48. J.A. R. Pimlott, Public Relations and American Democracy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951), p. 11.
49. Daniel Boorstin, The Image (New York: Atheneum, 1962), p. 268.
50. Harwood L. Childs, Public Opinion: Nature, Formation, and Role (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1965), pp. 276-278.
51. Variety, September 21, 1960, p. 76.